IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellant:	Keith H. Baker et al	:	Paper No.:
Serial No.:	10/671,969	:	Group Art Unit: 1762
Filed:	September 26, 2003	:	Examiner: Elena Tsoy

For: **Compositions For Treating Shoes And Articles Employing Same**

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

EFS Web Electronic Submission
December 1, 2008

Dear Sir:

The present Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed by Certificate of EFS Electronic Transmission and received by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on September 30, 2008.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is the assignee of the present application, The Procter & Gamble Company.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other prior or pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings known to the Appellants, the Appellants' undersigned legal representative or the assignee which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or having a bearing on the Board's decision in the present appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-75 have been cancelled by prior Amendment. Claims 77-82 and 94-118 have been withdrawn from examination in a previous response. Claims 76, 83-93, and 119

stand rejected and are the subject of the present appeal. A complete copy of rejected claims 76, 83-93 and 119 is set forth in the **Claims Appendix**, below.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No claim amendments were made subsequent to the final rejection.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The present invention is generally directed to compositions, methods and articles of manufacture relating to overcoming conventional problems associated with cleaning shoes (see, e.g. page 1, Field of Invention, and, generally, Background of Invention) More particularly, according to independent claim 76, a method for treating one or more shoes comprising at least one surface made from natural leather is provided (e.g. page 8, lines 25-27, page 3, lines 25-26). The method comprises: contacting the one or more shoes directly or indirectly with one or more treating compositions, each of which comprises one or more benefit agents that imparts one or more desired benefits to the one or more shoes when the treating composition is applied directly or indirectly (see, e.g. page 9, lines 12-19) to the one or more shoes prior to and/or during and/or after washing the one or more shoes with or in an aqueous medium (e.g. page 94, line 13), wherein said treating composition is formulated to deliver an effective level of a calcium/magnesium removal agent without removing significant levels of chromium from the natural leather (see generally pages 15-25, and specifically page 16, lines 26-31 and page 17, lines 10-13) so that any damage as a result of washing the one or more shoes with or in an aqueous medium with application of the treating composition is reduced compared to washing the one or more shoes with or in an aqueous medium without application of the treating composition. (See, e.g. "Example" results set forth on pages 108-111 showing reduced relative sock liner and seam abrasion, taken with page 2, line 35 bridging to page 3, line 20).

Claim 83 further defines the method of claim 76 wherein at least one of the treating compositions comprises a cleaning composition (e.g. page 15, lines 11+, page 4, lines 3-5), and claims 84-87 and 89 further define this embodiment wherein the cleaning composition is applied to at least one exterior surface of the one or more shoes (page 4, lines 3-5, e.g.), is applied in the wash cycle of a washing machine (see page 106 "Wash Cycles"), is in the form of a gel (page 93, lines 3-4), is applied directly via an applicator (page 95, lines 16-18), is applied directly to at least one surface area of one or more shoes prior to placing the one or more shoes in the wash solution (page 95, lines 25-26), respectively. Claim 88 further defines the method of claim 87 wherein the applicator is a brush (page 112, lines 25-26).

Claim 90 recites the method of claim 76 further comprising placing the one or more shoes in a flexible article which may be done either by placing the one or more shoes in the same flexible article, placing the one or more shoes in separate flexible articles, and placing the article or articles into a wash solution (page 96, lines 28-33, page 97, lines 25-31. According to claim 91, the flexible article is a flexible container (e.g. page 97, line 25) and according to claim 92 the flexible article is a containment bag (page 95, line 20). In accordance with claim 119, which further defines claim 90, the one or more treatment compositions are releasably contained in the flexible article and released during the wash cycle (e.g. page 96, lines 34-37).

Claim 93 further defines the method according to claim 76 wherein the one or more benefit agents is selected from the group consisting of: cleaning agents, conditioning agents, disinfecting agents, antibacterial agents, antimicrobial agents, antifungal agents, odor control agents, waterproofing agents, soil release agents, brightening agents, alkaline pH modifiers, perfume, and mixtures thereof (page 3, lines 29-76 and page 8, lines 20-24, e.g.).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The following issues are presented for consideration by the Board:

1. The rejection of claims 76, 83-93 and 119 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Document 10-276961 to Watanabe ("Watanabe") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,306,435 to Ishikawa et al. ("Ishikawa") and Chinese Patent Abstract No. 1052685A to Wu et al. ("Wu").

2. The rejection of claims 85, 90-92, and 119 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Document No. 10-276961 to Watanabe ("Watanabe") in view of Japanese Patent Document No. 09-271597 to Yoshioka et al. ("Yoshioka").

VII. ARGUMENTS

1. As will be set forth in detail below, it is believed the methods for treating shoes defined by claims 76, 83-93 are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable from the teachings of Watanabe in view of Ishikawa and Wu. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be reversed. Favorable action by the Board is respectfully requested.

A. The Rejection

In the Official Actions dated March 28, 2008 and July 30, 2008, the Examiner argues that Watanabe discloses a method for treating leather shoes comprising pressure-spraying a solution of a gel detergent inside the shoes to remove dirt, odor and fungi from the shoe without harming the shoes. The Watanabe detergent is composed of palm oil and soap (including a surfactant), amino acid group containing water at pH 5, orange fruit surfactant, herbal oil extracts, and enzyme protease. Watanabe discloses wiping the inner part of the shoes with a brush, while quickly "washing" the outside of the shoes using a gel "detergent B" made by mixing palm oil, glycerin, palm kernel oil, lanolin and wax with acidic water.

According to the Examiner, Watanabe teaches that a softening agent is sprayed onto the shoe surfaces and dried, after which a fluorine containing water repellent is sprayed on the outer layer of the shoes. While the Examiner asserts that Watanabe discloses that the leather is ordinary leather, the Examiner states that Watanabe is silent about whether or not significant levels of a tanning agent such as Chromium is removed from the leather during washing.

The Examiner contends that it is well-known in the art that ordinary leather for making clothing and shoes generally is a tanned leather wherein the leather is tanned using conventional tanning agents such as chromium salt, as evidenced by Ishikawa which is applied for the teaching that chromium salt is generally used for tanning leather and tanned leather is used for making shoes. Neither of these contentions, nor the conclusion that the leather disclosed by Watanabe is therefore tanned leather, is necessarily disputed or considered relevant to patentability of the instant methods by Appellants.

The crux of the Examiner's analysis is a factual stipulation. The Examiner notes that Watanabe claims that his washing methods do not damage shoes. The Examiner therefore "takes official notice that the tanned leather stays practically intact after washing, i.e. the washing does not remove any significant amount of components of the leather including any tanning agent such as chromium."

The Examiner also takes the position that since the detergent of Watanabe is disclosed as "capable of removing dirt", the detergent must necessarily deliver a calcium/magnesium removal agent to the shoes "because dirt normally contains calcium and magnesium." The Examiner relies on the Wu disclosure of a cleaning composition for casual leather shoes that comprises, inter alia, various surface active agents, deionized water, brightening agents, "dissolution synergists," bactericides, and a colloid fatty cleaning agent," which is disclosed by Wu as capable of removing Ca/Mg ions, to support the implication that the composition of Watanabe, since it removes dirt, therefore also removes Ca/Mg ions. Once again, Appellants

do not dispute this implication since detergents ordinarily contain transition metal chelators which remove all transition metal ions including Ca and Mg, as well as Cr.

The Examiner concludes that the instant base claim is rendered obvious by Watanabe in view of Wu since Watanabe discloses cleaning compositions for shoes comprising agents which remove Ca/Mg ions as indicated by Wu, but which do not damage shoes and therefore by stipulation do not remove Cr ions from the leather portions of the shoes.

B. The Examiner's makes an improper stipulation of fact and draws an unreasonable inference in her application of Watanabe to the claimed invention.

Independent claim 76 is directed to a method for treating one or more shoes comprising at least one surface made from a natural leather. In pertinent part, the method comprises application of treating compositions formulated to deliver an effective level of a calcium/magnesium removal agent without removing significant levels of chromium from the natural leather, which is results in a decrease in relative damage to a shoe as a result of washing the one or more shoes with or in an aqueous medium with application and without application of the treating composition. The instant specification provides several pages of ample and specific guidance on formulation manipulations which achieve this formulation limitation. Appellants note that these manipulations involve multiple formulation factors.

The primary reference Watanabe, on the other hand, is directed to cleaning methods for shoes that involve low pressure-spray application of vegetable-based compositions to the interior of shoes. Watanabe seeks to solve problems in the art associated with washing the insides of shoes without resorting to immersion in aqueous solutions or mechanical agitation, which damage shoes. Watanabe teaches spraying a detergent under pressure so that the detergent is dispersed uniformly inside the shoe without scrubbing or brushing or requiring that the detergent remain in the shoe for long periods of time. This, according to Watanabe,

prevents the associated damage to leather. Appellants submit that when Watanabe claims his methods do not damage shoes, Watanabe is referring to the damage identified by Watanabe, that is, the damage caused by immersion and mechanical agitation. Notably, the instant methods contemplate both immersion and mechanical agitation (ordinary washing machine based washing, e.g.) and identify the relevant damage as that caused by inadvertent removal of Chromium ions from tanned leather.

The Examiner makes a reaching, unsupported and therefore improper stipulation that since Watanabe claims that his methods "do not damage shoes," the detergents employed in the Watanabe methods must therefore remove Ca and Mg ions without removing Cr ions from the leather portion of shoes. The damage discussed by and relevant to Watanabe is that caused by aqueous immersion and mechanical agitation which the methods of Watanabe are designed to avoid. Therefore when Watanabe states that his methods result in "no damage" to the shoes, he is specifically referring to the identified damage. Watanabe fails to consider or discuss other damage causation factors, such as that addressed by the instant inventive methods - removal of chromium from tanned leather which decreases the suppleness and increases the brittleness of the leather. Appellants submit that there are many independent wash related factors which may cause damage to shoes during washing. In a general logical sense, there is no way, without proper controls in a multi-factorial approach, that one can relate causative factors to one another. In a specific sense, it is a non-sequitor (as well as simply incorrect) to assert that avoiding damage caused by immersing shoes in water and mechanical agitation of shoes also avoids damage caused by inadvertent removal of chromium ions from tanned leather due to use of conventional detergents which remove transition metal ions.

A focus of the instant methods is on reducing the damage caused by conventional detergents in conventional formulations which seek removal of Ca/Mg ions, but which achieve this nonspecifically causing undesirable leaching/removal of chromium ions from leather portions of shoes. The instant methods are based on the present inventors' recognition of this problem and permit removal of Ca and Mg without removal of Cr. Watanabe and the secondary references teach conventional detergents to remove Ca/Mg and do not recognize or address the impact of using these detergents on leather shoes wherein chromium ions, which are necessary to keep the integrity and suppleness of the leather, are also removed. Watanabe discloses reduction of wash related damage by avoiding immersion in aqueous compositions, avoiding mechanical agitation, and application of halogenated coatings. There are no facts disclosed in Watanabe which support the Examiner's contention regarding removal of Ca/Mg without removal of chromium. Although Watanabe and Wu specifically discusses the washing of leather portions of shoes, a person of ordinary skill in the art seeking guidance on washing leather shoes would neither be made aware of the problem nor be guided in ways to avoid it by reference to Watanabe, Ishikawa and Wu.

Watanabe never acknowledges nor attempts to address the damage to shoes caused by nonspecific detergents. When Watanabe discusses lack of damage to shoes, Watanabe is speaking relatively when compared to methods which rely on mechanical agitation or prolonged exposure to moisture/aqueous conditions. Appellants note that both of these techniques are contemplated as part of washing regimens in the instant teachings. Appellants methods decrease the wash related damage associated with these conventional consumer cleaning regimens by specific formulation of the treating compositions employed in these methods to avoid removal of chromium from tanned leather portions of shoes. Watanabe discloses methods that involve spray misting and wiping of detergents on to the shoes, suctioning the interior of shoes, and ozone-treatment in a sealed bag for several hours

followed by exposure to charcoal for 24 hours. Watanabe seeks to minimize exposure to water to prevent mold formation and water/detergent penetration to the inner core of the shoe material. In another embodiment Watanabe adds a final step of sprinkling a fluorine-repelling system over the exterior of the shoe. Once again, Watanabe notes that by keeping the actual wash portion of the process to less than 15 minutes, mold formation and bruising are prevented.

With respect specifically to damaging shoes by the cleaning process, Watanabe notes that "as a result of shortening working hours" (P18) and as a result of the fact that the detergent never permeates the core of the shoe (P18), mold and damage to the leather are prevented." Watanabe also notes that the pressure of the spray may be adjusted to prevent damage, and that the extreme drying methods may prevent mold related damage to leather.

Watanabe *never* discusses impact of detergent on the leather portion of a shoe and never discloses detergent formulation as a means to control or prevent damage to the leather portions of shoes during washing. Watanabe is concerned with avoiding mechanical damage or "bruising" to surface leather of a shoe that typically occurs during a dry cleaning processes, and with avoiding exposing the shoe to long periods of moisture/conditions for mold growth. Watanabe is also concerned with providing cleaning methods that remove human organic matter which results in odors and bacterial growth on the inside of a shoe, without resort to immersion or harsh cleaning conditions typically relied on to control this problem. Watanabe never discusses the use of a Ca/Mg removal agent or problems associated with typically resultant undesirable removal of chromium, or formulation manipulations for achieving selective transition metal ion removal.

C. The combination of Watanabe, Ishikawa and Wu fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

The detergents disclosed by Watanabe are conventional and are disclosed to include a high percent of soap (28%, e.g. P13), acidic conditions, and the presence of anionic surfactant systems (P13). Appellants do not dispute the Examiner's contention that the detergents of Watanabe remove transition metal ions from the shoes, including Ca/Mg and Cr. Indeed, the detergent formulations of Watanabe specifically include ingredients instantly disclosed as having the potential to remove chromium (see Specification, e.g. page 25, lines 26-35, providing guidance on formulation manipulations which preserve chromium in leather).

Ishikawa is applied to evidence that it is common knowledge in the art that "chromium salt" is generally used for tanning leather. Appellants do not disagree with the statement that tanning may be achieved via vegetable or mineral tanning agents, and that a common mineral tanning agent is chromium. Watanabe mentions "leather" in several places and Appellants agree that the leather intended for use in clothing and shoes is necessarily tanned and that the term "leather" in this context includes Cr-tanned leather within its scope.

Wu is a one paragraph Chinese patent abstract with very limited disclosure. It is applied for supporting the Examiner's contention that "dirt normally contains calcium and magnesium so that anything that removes "dirt" removes these elements." Wu discloses a decontaminating composition for leather shoes that includes many ingredients such as brightening agents, surfactants, bactericides, and fatty cleaning agents. Wu discloses that the composition removes Ca and Mg. Appellants do not find this disclosure relevant to the question of whether the methods remove chromium ions from leather portions of shoes, and Wu fails to provide guidance on this aspect or to overcome the deficiencies of Ishikawa and Watanabe.

The instant inventive methods require, inter alia, a treatment composition formulated to deliver an effective level of a calcium/magnesium removal agent without removing significant levels of chromium from the natural leather. As noted in the instant specification, dirt which is particulate and includes, e.g. clay and soil, includes Ca and Mg ions which may be removed with agents which bind transition metal ions. The present inventors recognize that this is problematic in the cleaning of leather shoes, however, since while it is desirable to remove Ca and Mg ions, tanned leather contains chromium which is necessary for the suppleness and integrity of the leather so that removal of Cr ions is undesirable. The instant specification notes that conventional formulations do not recognize this issue and include non-selective transition metal ion removing agents/chelators which may damage leather present in a shoe that is washed with conventional detergents. The instant specification, as noted previously, provides ample guidance for how to formulate a treatment composition to be selective for the removal of Ca and Mg ions while avoiding undesirable removal of Cr ions.

As noted by the Examiner, Watanabe and Wu disclose very general detergents that include components that remove Ca and Mg, generally recognized as desirable in the art of shoe treatment compositions. However, the Examiner errs in his deductive reasoning in concluding that since Watanabe discloses that his methods do not damage shoes, including leather shoes, his detergents therefore do not remove Cr ions in accordance with the present methods. Neither Ishikawa nor Wu are relevant to this error.

According to the Examiner's flawed deductive reasoning, since Watanabe, Ishikawa and Wu disclose compositions comprising detergents which remove Ca/Mg ions, and Watanabe discloses that his methods do not damage shoes, the compositions disclosed by the references must not remove Cr ions, otherwise they would damage shoes which contradicts the statement of Watanabe. Clearly, as set forth in detail above, this error results from the

Examiner's failure to identify the scope of "damage" relevant to the Watanabe disclosure, which is entirely distinct from the scope of damage relating to that caused by removal of Cr ions from leather portions of shoes.

There are numerous wash-related factors which may be targeted to reduce wash-related damage to shoes. The instant inventive methods and Watanabe target different factors. It is facetious to suggest that because Watanabe claims that his methods do not damage shoes, he must be inherently using the instant methods. Appellants assertion that the instant methods reduce wash-related damage is empirically supported as set forth in the specification. Watanabe's assertion of eliminating wash-related damage is merely an unsupported superlative based on methods which avoid certain obvious damaging factors such as mechanical agitation and aqueous immersion.

Appellants note that the detergent formulations disclosed by Watanabe are no more than conventional formulations which result in the undesirable removal of Cr ions from leather. For example, Watanabe discloses use of detergents containing formulation components such as anionic surfactants at acidic pH whereas the instant specification teaches that conventional Ca/Mg ion removal agents in compositions also comprising anionic surfactants at acidic pH remove Cr ions.

In a November 28, 2008 Advisory Action to Appellants' Request for Reconsideration dated September 30, 2008, the Examiner re-iterates her stipulation and inferences set forth above. Further, the Examiner asserts that the instant claims fail to recite specific formulation criteria for achieving selective removal of transition metal ions. Appellants agree that the claim limitation as recited is non-specific as to components; however Appellants contend that the limitation as written is distinguishing since Appellants are the first to consider and require specificity of detergent action on transition metal ion removal from leather portions of shoes in order to reduce wash related damage to shoes. The limitation is achieved by manipulating

various components of the formulation as guided in the instant specification. Reciting the entire body of formulation guidance, which involves, e.g. multi-factorial considerations set forth over several pages of disclosure, in the claims is simply not necessary. The underpinning limitation as recited is easily ascertained and determinable as existing or infringed. It is the selectivity limitation itself which is both novel and nonobvious over the art. The recitation of removing Ca/Mg ions while retaining Cr ions defines a scope of formulation manipulations that achieves this.

To establish prima facie obviousness of the claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art, *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). The combination of Watanabe, Ishikawa and Wu fails to teach or suggest methods for treating shoes comprising, inter alia, application of a treating composition formulated to deliver an effective level of a calcium/magnesium removal agent without removing significant levels of chromium from the natural leather, thereby relatively reducing wash-related damage to shoes. Watanabe teaches methods including various ways to avoid wash-related damage to shoes including avoidance of dry cleaning, mechanical agitation and minimizing exposure to water, but Watanabe does not recognize or address the damage associated with the use of cleaning agents in formulations which non-selectively remove transition metal ions causing Cr ion removal from leather portions of shoes. The Examiner's contention that because Watanabe discloses that damage to the shoes is avoided by use of his methods, therefore Watanabe must disclose Appellants' methods represents flawed deductive reasoning based on an improper stipulation of fact. Neither of the secondary references teaches or suggests methods which comprise treatment compositions formulated for selective transition metal ion removal nor to they acknowledge the problem of Cr removal from leather.

Dependent claims are nonobvious under section 103 if the independent claims from which they depend are nonobvious. *Hartness Int'l, Inc. v. Simplimatic Eng'g Co.*, 819 F.2d 1100, 1108, 2 USPQ2d 1826, 1831 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Hence, the methods for treating shoes defined by independent claim 76 and claims 83-93, and 119 dependent therefrom are nonobvious and patentably distinguishable from Watanabe, Ishikawa and Wu. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims is improper and should be removed.

* * *

2. As will be set forth in detail below, it is believed the methods for treating shoes defined by claims 85, 90-92, and 119 are nonobvious and patentably distinguishable from the teachings of Watanabe and Yoshioka. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be reversed. Favorable action by the Board is respectfully requested.

A. **The Rejection**

Specifically, Watanabe is applied for the reasons set forth above. The Examiner notes that Watanabe fails to teach that shoes are placed into a flexible bag but applies Yoshioka for the disclosure that shoes can be washed in flexible bags to prevent damage to shoes. Yoshioka fails to teach or suggest methods comprising treatment compositions which overcome the deficiencies of Watanabe.

Appellants note that all the claims rejected under this basis depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 76 and relate to the flexible bag technology. The nonobviousness of claim 76 over Watanabe is established in detail set forth above. Yoshioka fails to address or overcome the deficiencies of Watanabe as applied to independent claim 76.

Dependent claims are nonobvious under section 103 if the independent claims from which they depend are nonobvious. *Hartness Int'l, Inc. v. Simplimatic Eng'g Co.*, 819 F.2d

1100, 1108, 2 USPQ2d 1826, 1831 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Hence, the rejection of claims 76, 85, 90-92 and 119 is improper and reversal is earnestly solicited.

* * * * * *

For all of the reasons identified above, the rejections of claims 76, 83-93, and 119 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are improper and should be reversed. Favorable action by the Board is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Denise M. Everett/
Denise M. Everett
Registration No. 47,552
Dinsmore & Shohl LLP
1900 Chemed Center
255 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 977-8787

CLAIMS APPENDIX

Claim 76. A method for treating one or more shoes comprising at least one surface made from a natural leather, the method comprising contacting the one or more shoes directly or indirectly with one or more treating compositions, each of which comprises one or more benefit agents that imparts one or more desired benefits to the one or more shoes when the treating composition is applied directly or indirectly to the one or more shoes prior to and/or during and/or after washing the one or more shoes with or in an aqueous medium, wherein said treating composition is formulated to deliver an effective level of a calcium/magnesium removal agent without removing significant levels of chromium from the natural leather so that any damage as a result of washing the one or more shoes with or in an aqueous medium with application of the treating composition is reduced compared to washing the one or more shoes with or in an aqueous medium without application of the treating composition.

Claim 83. The method of claim 76, wherein at least one of the treating compositions comprises a cleaning composition.

Claim 84. The method of claim 83, wherein the cleaning composition is applied to at least one exterior surface of the one or more shoes.

Claim 85. The method of claim 83, wherein the cleaning composition is applied in the wash cycle of a washing machine.

Claim 86. The method of claim 83, wherein the cleaning composition is in the form of a gel.

Claim 87. The method of claim 83, wherein the cleaning composition is applied directly via an applicator.

Claim 88. The method of claim 87, wherein the applicator is a brush.

Claim 89. The method of claim 83 wherein the cleaning composition is applied directly to at least one exterior surface of the one or more shoes prior to placing the one or more shoes in the wash solution.

Claim 90. The method as recited in claim 76 which further comprises placing the one or more shoes in a flexible article which may either be done by placing the one or more shoes in the same flexible article, or placing the one or more shoes in separate flexible articles, and placing the article or articles into a wash solution.

Claim 91. The method as recited in claim 90 wherein the flexible article is a flexible container.

Claim 92. The method as recited in claim 91 wherein the flexible article is a containment bag.

Claim 93. The method according to claim 76 wherein the one or more benefit agents is selected from the group consisting of: cleaning agents, conditioning agents, disinfecting agents, antibacterial agents, antimicrobial agents, antifungal agents, odor control

agents, waterproofing agents, soil release agents, brightening agents, alkaline pH modifiers, perfume, and mixtures thereof.

Claim 119. The method according to claim 90, wherein the one or more treatment compositions are releasably contained in the flexible article and released during the wash cycle.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.